Claims 1-33, 35, and 36 were pending in the application when previously examined, all of which stand rejected. Claims 1, 15, 20, 35, and 36 are amended, and Claim 26 is canceled. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 20-25 and 27-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,219,694 to Lazaridis et al. ("Lazaridis") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,847,892 to Zhou ("Zhou"). Claims 1-19, 26, 35, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lazaridis and Zhou, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,366,522 to Thomas ("Thomas").

Claim 1 is patentable over Lazaridis, Zhou, and Thomas because it recites, "a user interface unit that is configured to generate a command for controlling a mobile unit and transmit the command in an electronic mail, wherein the mobile unit is configured to ... extract the command from the electronic mail...." Support for the user interface unit being configured to control a mobile unit via commands embedded in electronic mail may be found in a number of places in the Application, for example at page 7, lines 7-9. Support for the mobile unit being configured to extract the configuration command from an electronic mail and generate a report according to the command may be found, for example, at page 7, line 29 through page 8, line 7.

The Office Action, while acknowledging that Lazaridis does not teach a user interface unit that generates and transmits a configuration command and a mobile unit remotely receiving the configuration command ..., points to Zhou as correcting these

deficiencies (see Office Action dated August 16, 2011, page 5). Further, the Office Action points to Thomas as teaching formatting the report according to an electronic mail protocol (Id.). However, none of the references contemplates or suggests remotely configuring a report via email. For example, the limitation "transmit[ting] the configuration command in an electronic mail..." is not disclosed or suggested by any of the references. Zhou describes transmitting a configuration command from ASP 200 (perhaps "the user interface unit") to the Device 100 (perhaps "the mobile unit") in column 27, lines 13-24, for example to specify a time interval for reporting data to the ASP 200. However, this transmission is done according to the Standard Data Protocol 1 (STDP-1) (see Zhou, column 23, line 61 – column 24, line 4), and is not "in an electronic mail." Thomas mentions email transmission from the mobile unit to the location monitoring server (Thomas, column 3, lines 60-64), but fails to teach transmitting a command to the mobile unit for controlling a mobile unit via an electronic mail. As for Lazaridis, it mentions a redirection program that intercepts an incoming message to a mobile unit, divides up a message, and redirects the parts to different destinations (see Lazaridis, column 6, lines 22-28). However, there is no mention that any part of the redirected message is a command for controlling a mobile unit.

For the reasons provided above, Lazaridis, Zhou, and Thomas fail to teach that "the mobile unit is configured to ... extract the configuration command from the electronic mail ...." There is no command to be extracted from an electronic mail in any of the references.

Independent Claim 15, similarly, is patentable over Lazaridis, Zhou, and Thomas because it recites "a mobile communication device comprising: ... a processor ... configured to ... extract a configuration command from the electronic mail ..." (underline added). As explained above, Lazaridis and Thomas mention electronic mail but fail to teach receiving a

command in an electronic mail. Zhou discloses a mobile unit receiving commands but also fails to teach receiving a command in an electronic mail. As none of the references disclose a command embedded in electronic mail, they cannot teach "a processor ... configured to ... extract a configuration command from the electronic mail."

Similarly, independent Claim 20 is patentable because it recites "extracting a configuration command ... from the electronic mail...." As mentioned above, neither Lazaridis nor Zhou discloses transmitting/receiving a command in an electronic mail. Hence, they do not teach or suggest extracting a command from an electronic mail.

Claims 2-14, 16-19, 21-25, and 27-33 depend from independent Claims 1, 15, and 20 and are thus patentable over the cited references for the same reason as the independent claims.

Independent Claims 35 and 36 are patentable over Lazaridis, Zhou, and Thomas because they recite "receiving an electronic mail and extracting a configuration command from the electronic mail..." (underline added). The explanation provided above applies here.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks set forth above, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Authorization is given to charge any fees due or credit any overpayments in regard to this communication to deposit account 50-5029. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns, a telephone call to the undersigned at (408) 331-1672 is welcomed and encouraged.

<table>
<tr><td>

Certification of Electronic Transmission

Certificate of Transmission: I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) via the USPTO's EFS-Web electronic system on:

November 11, 2011

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Kieun "Jenny" Sung

/Kieun "Jenny" Sung/ _____

</td><td>

Respectfully submitted,

/Kieun "Jenny" Sung/ _____
Kieun "Jenny" Sung
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 48,639

</td></tr>
</table>

Innovation Counsel LLP
21771 Stevens Creek Boulevard, Suite 200
Cupertino, California 95014
Telephone: (408) 331-1670
Facsimile: (408) 725-8263
E-mail: jsung@innovationcounsel.com